

To: Godsey, Cindi[Godsey.Cindi@epa.gov]
Cc: Shaw, Hanh[Shaw.Hanh@epa.gov]
From: Cool, Richard
Sent: Fri 2/8/2013 6:26:25 PM
Subject: Cook Inlet Authorizations - November 2011 summary
[Chevron Coverage Letter.pdf](#)

CINDI; per our call here is some draft text that you can use, edit, reject, etc. as you deem appropriate for an email to Gerry Brown in light of Hanh's submission of the November 2011 summary to him in an earlier email. Hanh is in and will likely look at this draft email so you might consider a short delay in case she has concerns.

Again, please copy me and Hanh on any final sent email. I will do up a cover memo and get your OK on that too so that this Nov. 2011 list is included in the Versatile files.
Thanks.

Hi Gerry:

Just a short follow-up on Hanh's email to you this morning with the November 2011 AKG315000 summary.

I am attaching a copy of the May 2007 Chevron authorization coverage letter for your background. You will see that the NPU letter for Chevron's facilities did not expressly identify the authorized outfalls (e.g. 001, 002, etc.) but instead relied on the previously submitted permit applications for that information.

The NPU-prepared November 2011 summary was derived from permit applications and it is our understanding that this summary was initially used to populate ICIS for AKG315000 covered facilities and outfalls.

As Rick noted in his February 5 email to Linda Ward, Hilcorp, (copied to you and me), there appear to be some discrepancies with regard to the Granite Point Platform authorized outfalls and DMR submissions that need to be clarified. Rick will continue to work with Linda and DEC on clarifying those issues and he will be sure to keep DEC informed of any developments. DEC should feel free to contact Rick if you have any immediate questions but we understand that Linda is likely doing some background checking before contacting Rick directly in response to his email.

I want to caution you that some of the facilities' authorizations have been revised since preparation of the November 2011 summary. For example, NPU revised Furie's (formerly Escopeta) coverages to eliminate 015-produced water because that discharge is not applicable or authorized for an exploration facility. In addition, NPU revised Buccaneer authorizations to expand the authorized outfalls for its exploration rig. I point out these examples merely to caution you on reliance on this November 2011 summary in your updating of DROPs and on the

possible need to review the current files for any authorization changes that might have been made since initial submittals of permit applications and NOIs used for creating the 2011 summary.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Cindi